

REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claim 1 is allowable and for indicating that claims 6, 9, and 10 contain allowable subject matter.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-10 were pending in the present application. By way of this reply, claim 6 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-5 and 7-10 are now pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 2 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 2.

Claim Amendments

Independent claim 2 has been amended by way of this reply to incorporate limitations of now-cancelled claim 6, and claim 4 has been amended to correct an antecedent basis error. Additionally, claims 1, 2, and 4 have been amended to correct minor errors. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

Objection(s)

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to for improperly indicating plural instances of the term LED as singular, and for awkward grammar. By way of this reply, the abstract has been amended to indicate that plural instances of the term “LED” read as “LEDs,” and to remove awkward grammar indicated by the Examiner (*i.e.*, “from LED” has been changed to “from the LEDs”). Additionally, the abstract has been amended to remove other minor errors. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the abstract is respectfully requested.

The title of the invention is objected to for not being descriptive. By way of this reply, the title of the invention has been amended to “Disc Drive Apparatus and Electronic Device with Indication Mechanism Using a Plurality of Light Emitting Elements,” to more clearly describe the invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the title is respectfully requested.

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities. By way of this reply, the disclosure has been amended to replace instances of “LED” with “LEDs” (as appropriate), and to remove awkward grammar. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the reference to “of a low luminance light emitting element” is misdescriptive. The Examiner asserts that it is not readily apparent whether the aforementioned light emitting element is part of or is separate from the “plurality of light emitting elements” set forth in line 3 of the claim. However, claim 2 clearly requires that “said low luminance light emitting element is one of said plurality of light emitting elements and emits light lower in luminance than at least one of said plurality of light emitting elements.”

For example, as discussed with reference to Figure 2 of the Specification, in one exemplary embodiment of the invention, an LED 15 emitting red light and an LED 16 emitting

blue light are arranged on a substrate **14**. The luminance of blue light emitted from LED **16**, as a low luminance light emitting element, is lower than that of red light emitted from LED **15** as a high luminance light emitting element (*see* Specification, page 10, lines 18-25). Thus, it would be readily apparent from claim 2 that the low luminance light emitting element is one of the plurality of light emitting elements, and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the phrase “the same color base” lacks antecedent basis. The Examiner also asserts that it is not apparent what “color base” encompasses. Claim 4, as amended, requires that a color of the light reflecting film is one selected from the group consisting of white, a metallic color, and a color of the light emitted from the low luminance light emitting element. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on page 14, lines 9-18 of the Specification. Accordingly, it is now clear that a color of the light reflecting film is one selected from the group consisting of white, a metallic color, and a color of the light emitted from the low luminance light emitting element, and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the reference to “an indication character” is vague. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that this term is not vague. For example, as discussed on page 14, lines 19-25 of the Specification, in one embodiment of the invention, a white print portion **17** is the same as other indication characters formed on the surface of substrate **14**, which allows white print portion **17** to be formed simultaneously with indication characters. The term “indication character” may encompass any character printed on the surface of a substrate, such as, for example, text, numbers or figures that would be printed on the surface of a substrate (e.g., model numbers), marks that would represent an arrangement of components on the substrate, or other marks. These marks are often provided

on the surface of a substrate of an electronic device, and the term “indication character,” referring to such marks, would be readily understood by one skilled in the art. Thus, the term “indication character” is not vague, and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 2-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 2001053340 in the name of Hiromoto (hereinafter “Hiromoto”). Independent claim 2 has been amended to incorporate all limitations of allowable claim 6. Further, claim 2 has minor amendments to correct grammar. Accordingly, claim 2, as amended, is now allowable. Claims 3, 4, and 7, directly or indirectly dependent from claim 2, are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hiromoto. Independent claim 2 has been amended to incorporate all limitations of allowable claim 6. Further, claim 2 has minor amendments to correct grammar. Accordingly, claim 2, as amended, is now allowable. Claims 5 and 8, indirectly dependent from claim 2, are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places the present application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 04536/013001).

Dated: November 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
for Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

124354_1